

# THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, 1900.

The Remonstrance is published annually by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, California, South Dakota, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

## State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

### MASSACHUSETTS.

Twenty-seven Branch Committees; members in 177 cities and towns.

MRS. J. ELLIOT CABOT, President.  
MRS. ROBERT W. LORD, Secretary,  
405 Marlboro Street, Boston.

#### Chairmen of Sub-Committees.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD, Organization.  
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY, Interstate.

### NEW YORK.

Six Branches Central Association; three Judicial Districts.

MRS. FRANCIS M. SCOTT, Honorary Chairman.  
MRS. GILBERT E. JONES, Acting Chairman.  
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary,  
445 West 31st Street, New York City.

#### Chairmen of Sub-Committees.

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, Interstate.  
MRS. ROSSITER JOHNSON, Education.

#### Officers of Judicial Districts.

MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM, Chairman.  
MISS LILIAN HART, Secretary,  
444 Sixth Street, Brooklyn.  
MRS. ROGER SHERMAN,  
Prospect Avenue, Mt. Vernon.  
MRS. PRUYN, Honorary President.  
MRS. W. J. WALLACE, Acting President.  
MRS. W. W. CRANNELL, Chairman,  
9 Hall Place, Albany.

### ILLINOIS.

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.  
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON, } Vice-Presidents.  
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY, }  
MRS. JAMES B. BARNET, Secretary,  
1923 Deming Street, Chicago.

### OREGON.

MRS. R. W. WILBUR, President.  
MRS. W. J. LADD, } Vice-  
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY, } Presidents.  
MRS. ROBERT LOVETT TAFT, Secretary,  
534 Morrison Street, Portland, Ore.

### IOWA COMMITTEE.

MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, Chairman.  
MRS. SIMON CASSIDY, Vice-Chairman.  
MRS. HENRY FOSTER, Secretary *pro tem.*,  
The Normandy, Des Moines.

### WASHINGTON COMMITTEES.

#### Seattle.

MRS. JOHN LEARY, President.  
MRS. S. B. HARDIN, Vice-President.  
MRS. G. D. BACON, Secretary,  
512 10th Avenue.

#### Tacoma.

MRS. CHAUNCEY W. GRIGGS, President.  
MRS. FITCH B. STACEY, Vice-President.  
MRS. A. B. BULL, Secretary,  
924 G Street, North Tacoma.

The aggressive campaigns of the National Woman Suffrage Association have aroused women in other Western States. They are not yet formally organized, but they are in correspondence with each other, and they hold themselves ready for active opposition whenever occasion arises. This is especially true of California and South Dakota.

## IN SELF-DEFENSE.

ONE of the most misleading arguments of the advocates of woman suffrage is that women need the ballot for self-defense, especially against unjust laws regarding property. But in the argument of the New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women at Albany last year, it was shown that liberal legislation securing property rights to married women preceded the woman suffrage agitation and was not affected by it. The suffrage movement began in 1848. Four years previous Rhode Island enacted a law securing property rights to married women. Similar laws were adopted in Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, and Texas in 1848-49, in Maine and Alabama in 1850-52, and in New Hampshire, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Iowa in 1853; and in 1849, Ohio, Maine, Indiana, and Missouri enacted laws giving married women the right to their own earnings. But suffrage agitation had not been dreamed of in these widely separated states. These laws were not the result of any direct demand by women, but of a sense of justice which has led legislators to remove the disabilities under which women once labored. These reforms, secured without

the possession of the ballot by women, show the fallacy of the argument that the property-holding woman needs the ballot for self-defense.

## "A NEW TOY."

THE number of women who registered in Chicago for the purpose of voting for school trustees dropped from 29,815 in 1894 to 1,488 in 1898. Dr. Julia Homes Smith, President of the Political Equality Club, being asked by a reporter of the Chicago Times-Herald to explain this falling off, said (Chicago Times-Herald, October 27, 1898):—

I think we are like children with a new toy. A novelty at first, it has become something we do not care at all for. . . . I registered, but I see that there are only thirty-two other women in this ward, the Twenty-second, who had their names entered.

## THE QUESTION IN OREGON.

IN February last year the legislature of Oregon, after hasty consideration, adopted a resolution to submit to the people a constitutional amendment conferring full suffrage upon women. The proposition will go before the people at the state election next June. The Portland Oregonian, the most influential newspaper in the state, says of the general question of woman suffrage (November 12, 1898):—

The lack of the ballot surely robs a woman of no rights of life, liberty, or property. The reason why woman suffrage is not favored by the mass of women or the mass of men is because it is a barren ideal. It rights no wrongs, it corrects no disability. Women to-day have without the ballot all the civil and social rights exercised by men. As a natural right, suffrage belongs to neither man nor woman, for the ballot is only the child of an artificial social order to be granted or withheld as a matter of social and political expediency. The mere wish of a few women to vote is of no more consequence to the state than the mere wish of a few women to enlist in the regular army. That Moll Pitcher served her wounded husband's gun at Monmouth is not an argument for the expediency of enlisting women as artillerymen.



## FROM A WORKING WOMAN'S POINT OF VIEW.

It is often claimed that the economic disadvantages under which working women labor would disappear if they had the ballot. Eleanor Whiting, writing in Lippincott's Magazine, explains them on broader grounds:—

We often hear it said that the world is hard on women, and many people talk as if some exceptions might and should be made from the laws of modern industrialism in favor of women wage-earners. The world is hard, but no harder, no more unjust, to women than to men; and no legislation was ever yet enacted to protect or favor by artificial means one class of labor against another that harm did not result. If woman enters the business field, she must accept the conditions existing; and those conditions are the laws of supply and demand, and the competition resulting from their operation. No man or woman can enter the labor market and not compete, unless he or she possesses quite exceptional qualifications; and to compete is to strive with others for the same thing. Competition is a warfare, where your success is my defeat, where whoever takes up arms must fight, and where the one who exercises the greatest skill and the greatest endurance wins. Competition involves and compels the survival of the fittest as rigorously as do the laws of life and death.

That the woman who enters the field of business competes at a great disadvantage, owing to her physical disabilities, her lack of business habits and technical training, is true; but if women are to work on the same terms with men (and ask yourself what other terms are possible), they must accept the same conditions that men accept. . . .

I grant, of course, that all this is hard for the woman wage-earner; but I believe that it is strict justice, and I do not see, if the conditions were yet more bitter, how she would have a right to complain, as she often does, that she is not receiving her due. For at present the woman is not the equal of the man in the labor market. An average woman cannot do as much work, or as good work, or as varied work, as an average man could in her position; she is not his equal as a producer. For one thing, her labor is apt not to be continuous; she is far more likely than a man to be kept away by the weather, by sickness, by some special exigency in her family, etc. Again, her labor is apt not to be permanent; that is, it may cease at any moment. In 1895 the average age of women wage-earners was found to be twenty-two years. It is not stating it too broadly to say that any woman, at any time, may get married. Her employer knows in engaging her that when this opportunity occurs she will

leave him; and the fact that she grows more valuable to him the longer she stays will not prevent her from leaving. However capable, however loyal, however ambitious she may be, she will throw up her employer's advantage, she will fling to the winds all her past acquirements, all her future prospects, for the sake of getting married.

Marriage, actual or potential, vitiates woman's worth as a wage-earner, because it weakens her hold on her work, and (in the former case) eventually withdraws her from it altogether. On the other hand, marriage adds to the permanency and continuity of man's labor. For love of wife and child he will work harder and better and longer; society recognizes him as a more valuable factor; he is more complete married than single. A woman becomes more complete by marriage also, but her completeness not only fails to confirm her in her trade relations, but tends always to withdraw her from them into domestic relations.

## SCHOOL REGISTRATION IN BOSTON.

IN view of the increased registration of women in Boston last year, the following statistics of the registration and vote of Boston women for school committee for the last fifteen years are interesting. It must be remembered that this registration and vote includes anti-suffragists as well as suffragists. The large figures for the year 1888 were the result of a sectarian issue.

YEAR.	REGIS.	VOTE.
1884	1,119	1,026
1885	2,238	2,062
1886	1,193	878
1887	837	725
1888	20,252	19,490
1889	10,589	10,051
1890	7,925	7,439
1891	6,008	5,428
1892	9,992	9,510
1893	10,296	8,915
1894	11,091	8,733
1895	12,073	9,049
1896	10,340	6,417
1897	9,262	5,721
1898	8,723	5,201
1899	10,385	7,090

It is a question whether the growth last year will be a permanent thing or whether, as has happened so often in the past, this vote on the vital question of the public schools will prove a fluctuating quantity.

Last year the women's registration represented the result of strenuous, combined effort on the part of the Massachusetts Suffrage Association, the Independent Women Voters, and the Public School Association.

## WOMAN'S PLACE IN THE SOCIAL ECONOMY.

THE following is an extract from a letter sent by the Eastern Anti-Suffrage Associations of the United States to the International Congress of Women, which met in London in June, 1899:—

In accordance with the laws of nature, the differentiation of the sexes has been determined, and cannot be altered by man—or evolution. This scientific attitude must be conceded. The two sexes in the human species are fixed types, and anything interfering with the essential line of difference which has ever existed cannot be considered as progress in the right direction. We all wish to cultivate our womanhood to its perfect development. Every step taken toward that end should be welcomed. Every step which leads away from it should be opposed. This, then, is the vital principle of our opposition. The ballot, at the present time, *implies service to the state which women may not give and retain unimpaired their place in the social economy.*

The ballot implies military duty, police duty, jury duty, the holding of public office, the sharing in the public deliberations regarding the formation of the laws, and membership in the body which finally passes the laws.

. . . Every privilege should be shared by men and women, but the ballot is not a privilege. It is an obligation calling for the performance of certain duties of the State which require the physical strength belonging to men. If women seek to assume these duties, they ignore the physiological line of distinction between men and women, and the result bears directly and disastrously on the qualities affecting the home life and its duties.

*These duties in the economic life of the state are of equal importance with the duties specifically demanded of men.*

## VOTES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

THREE suffrage propositions came before the Massachusetts legislature in 1899: a constitutional amendment to confer the full suffrage upon women, a bill to permit women to vote upon the license question, and a bill giving them the ballot at municipal elections. All three propositions were adversely reported by the committees to which they were referred. March 3 a motion in the House to substitute a resolve for the adverse report of the committee on the constitutional amendment was defeated, 31 to 82. March 7 the license suffrage bill was defeated, 51 to 94; and the municipal suffrage bill was also defeated.



3  
 91-93  
 94  
 95

## THE SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT IN OREGON.

Appeal from Women of the State who are  
 opposed to Suffrage.

REPRESENTATIVES of the large majority of the women of Oregon who do not want the ballot have acted promptly in organizing the Oregon State Association Opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage to Women, the first work of which will be to oppose the proposed constitutional amendment. The Association, through its secretary, has sent out the following appeal to the voters of the state:—

### OREGON STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO THE EXTENSION OF THE SUFFRAGE TO WOMEN.

To the Voters of Oregon:

We desire to call your attention to the fact that an amendment to the constitution of Oregon, giving full suffrage to every adult woman in the state, is to be submitted to your vote in June, 1900.

We, being Oregon women, and therefore affected by the provisions of such an amendment, wish to enter our protest against its adoption by you.

We believe that only a small percentage of the women of our State ask for or desire the ballot. Our school elections prove, as do those of every state in the Union which permits women to vote at such elections, that the great majority of Oregon women do not use the ballot even in school matters, in which they may be presumed to take special interest on account of their children.

We believe that the majority should rule in this as in other political matters, and that a small, though eager, minority of our sex should not force the ballot (and its attendant privileges of sitting on juries and running for offices) upon the far larger number of women who do not desire to vote. We have no quarrel with our suffragist sisters; but we protest against their being regarded as representatives of the true opinion of Oregon women upon this vital subject.

We also believe that the adoption of this suffrage amendment would necessarily lead to serious complications in both the political and social conditions of the state, and that such complications would be harmful to the state in every way.

Believing these things, we have organized ourselves into an association, known as the Oregon State Association Opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage to Women. We are an absolutely non-political association, representing no creed or class, with only one aim—to keep our sex out of politics. We desire to bring the subject to your thorough attention as voters, and to ask you to defeat the amendment if, after thinking over the whole question, you agree with us that, since Oregon women do not want the ballot, it should not be forced upon them.

We ask you especially to record your vote on this amendment because, although any intelligent voter of this State knows that an overwhelming majority of his sex, as well as ours, are opposed to suffrage for women, yet there is danger that the minority vote will be rallied to the polls by the suffragists, while the majority neglect to cast their votes against the amendment. A majority of all the votes cast will decide the question, if it be but by a single vote, and a full vote is thus urgently necessary.

We request you to read the pamphlet which we enclose. It is printed, as you see, by a like association of women in the East. There are now such associations as ours in Massachusetts, New York, Iowa, Illinois, South Dakota, Washington, and California.\* The suffragists are a minority everywhere. We ask you to act in behalf of the great silent majority of Oregon women by voting against the suffrage amendment in June, 1900.

\* In South Dakota, Washington and California there are Committees, but not State Associations.

## IS MUNICIPAL SUFFRAGE CONSTITUTIONAL?

IN 1893 the Michigan legislature enacted a law to confer municipal suffrage upon women. The Supreme Court of the state declared the law unconstitutional on the ground that the source of all authority to vote at popular elections is the Constitution, and that wherever the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the legislature or otherwise, except by an amendment to the Constitution. The court quoted the provision of the Constitution that electors shall be male citizens, and affirmed that the terms are applicable to all elections.

The principles thus laid down are of general application. The leaders of the suffrage movement in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other states, continue to ask the legislatures to enact laws to give municipal suffrage to women. It is not likely that the framers of the constitutions of these states intended so great a change as that of doubling the electorate by admitting women to the ballot to be made at the caprice of a single legislature, without any expression of the popular will. It is highly probable that if the question comes before the courts, they will decide, as in Michigan, that such a proceeding is contrary to the letter as well as to the spirit of the state constitutions.

### FIFTY YEARS' FRUITS.

THE woman suffrage movement in the United States is about fifty years old. The advocates of woman suffrage are in the habit of circulating a statement of legislation favorable to their cause during that period, which is impressive until it is submitted to a close examination.

Briefly summarized, the chief fruits of the fifty years' agitation are these: In twenty-four states, women have some form of school suffrage, about which they care so little that only from two to five per cent of the women qualified to vote do so, under normal conditions.

In one state, Kansas, women vote for municipal officers. If the experiment had worked well it might be thought that the voters of the state would avail themselves of the first opportunity to extend to women the full suffrage. On the contrary, when a constitutional amendment giving women full suffrage on the same

terms as men was submitted to the people of Kansas in 1894, it was defeated by a majority of 34,827. In two or three states, women vote on questions submitted directly to tax-payers.

There are four states, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, and Colorado, in which women have the full suffrage. At the last federal census, when the United States had a population of 62,622,250, these four states had altogether a population of only 772,193. In other words, the population of the states which have adopted woman suffrage is about one and two tenths per cent of the total population of the country. At the elections in these four states in 1898, the total vote was 265,693.

There is no means of determining what portion of this vote was cast by women; but if it is assumed to have been one half, it follows that the participation of women in state and national elections, after fifty years of strenuous agitation, is represented by about 133,000 votes, while the whole number of women of voting age in the United States, according to the last census, is between fifteen and sixteen millions.

### DIMINISHING ZEAL IN THE WEST.

THE following figures of women voters on school questions are significant:—

CHICAGO, ILL.

Women registered in 1894: 29,815.  
 Less than 80 per cent voted.

Women registered in 1896: 5,636.  
 About 50 per cent voted.

Women registered in 1898: 1,488.  
 About 75 per cent voted.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

(From the Report of the Commissioner of Elections.)

Women registered in 1895: 5,831, of whom 4,945 voted.

Women registered in 1896: 2,728, of whom 1,632 voted.

Women registered in 1897: 408, of whom 228 voted.

Women registered in 1898: 82, of whom about 20 voted.

### SCHOOL SUFFRAGE IN NEW YORK.

MR. CHARLES R. SKINNER, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in New York, writing on January 7, 1899, to the Brooklyn Auxiliary of the New York Anti-Suffrage Association in reply to an inquiry whether school suffrage in New York State had been a success, said:—

Replying to your inquiry of the 6th inst., I advise you that so far as we have been able to secure statistics in reference to the participation of women in school meetings throughout the state, we find that less than two per cent of the women take advantage of the power to vote at school meetings conferred by the law of 1880.



## VOTING AND TAXPAYING.

THREE bills were introduced into the New York legislature last year providing for giving the ballot to taxpaying women upon questions involving the expenditure of public money. Six women members of the New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee February 22, to remonstrate against the bills. In a carefully prepared argument, they made this answer to the specious reasoning that it is unjust that women should pay taxes and have no voice as to the spending of public money:—

Virtually there is no connection between voting and taxpaying. When a millionaire becomes a bankrupt he does not lose his vote. This is because he does not lose capacity for the things the government counts on equally whether he is rich or poor, a taxpayer or a non-taxpayer. These are, police duty, jury duty, riot quelling, property guarding, and law defending, in peace or in war. The property of man, woman, and child is alike taxed, and in return for the payment of the tax they all get the same things—schools, roads, gas, water, police protection, etc. But there is another tax—the service tax—which is necessary to make the property of all taxpayers of any value. It is the service tax that gives security, and that tax is laid upon men alone. With this tax goes the vote. To give woman a taxpaying vote when she is exempted by nature and civilized usage from forming part of the defense of even her own property is to work injustice.

## WOULD WOMEN DO BETTER?

So far as the demand for woman suffrage rests on the supposed welfare of the community, it proceeds upon two assumptions: first, that the community is at present ill governed, and second, that if the task of governing devolved upon women, they would perform it better than men.

These assumptions, indeed, may not be definitely expressed, but they are essential to the suffrage argument. If states and cities are to be benefited by the admission of women to the ballot and to office, it must be that the states and cities are not now so well governed as they should be. It must be, also, that women are expected to improve existing conditions, otherwise the community would not profit by the extension to them of the suffrage. The direct claim of suffragists is that women are as well fitted for political duties as men; but the tacit assumption underlying their argument is that women are, in

fact, better fitted than men. In other words, things have gone wrong under masculine government; and the votes of women are needed to set them right.

When legislators are asked, for the public good, to confer the suffrage upon women, let them ask themselves whether these assumptions are true. If it is true that the government of states and cities by men in this country is a failure, what warrant is there for assuming that women would do better than men? Precisely what are the affairs of government concerning which women would act more intelligently than men? The raising of revenue, the distribution of taxation, the grant of franchises, the organization of police and fire departments, the building and care of roads and bridges, questions of water supply and drainage, the repression of crime, the award of contracts,—these are some of the subjects which engage the attention of city and state governments. Which of these and similar

questions are women more competent to deal with than men?

Surely, this is a fair question; and the advocates of woman suffrage, who insist that the community would be better off if women were admitted to the suffrage and to participation in the government, should be required to give an explicit answer.

## THE BALLOT NOT WANTED BY WOMEN.

LEGISLATORS should remember that only a very small proportion of women want the ballot. In Massachusetts, when the women of the state were invited to express their wishes at the "referendum" of 1895, only about four per cent of women entered to vote upon the question expressed a wish for the ballot in municipal elections. If there is any good reason why the ballot should be thrust upon nine-six per cent of the women because four per cent want it, what is it? If the wish of the majority governs in other matters, why not in this?

## RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

## IN 1897.

Proposed woman suffrage amendments to State constitutions were defeated in the Legislatures of California, Missouri, Massachusetts, Montana, and Nebraska; license suffrage bills were rejected in Connecticut and Massachusetts; municipal suffrage bills were defeated in Maine, Massachusetts, and Nebraska; a bill conferring presidential suffrage was adversely reported in Kansas; a bill extending school suffrage and making women eligible as school trustees was rejected in Kentucky; the constitutional convention in Delaware refused to strike the word "male" from the constitution; and suffrage bills were rejected in Nevada and Oklahoma.

## IN 1898.

In Massachusetts, the House, February 14, refused by a vote of 44 to 97 to substitute a resolve for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution for the adverse report of the committee to which the subject had been referred. By a vote of 18 to 74, with 42 pairs, the House refused to substitute a license suffrage bill for an adverse report. Adverse reports on municipal suffrage and presidential suffrage bills were accepted without a division. The Senate concurred in this action without discussion.

In Ohio, a resolve for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the House.

In Kentucky, the House rejected a proposition to exempt from taxation the property of women while they are not permitted to vote.

In Iowa, the House defeated a resolve to submit to the voters an amendment striking out the word "male" from the constitution.

In Rhode Island, the commission appointed to revise the constitution rejected all propositions to make provision for woman suffrage.

In South Dakota, a proposed amendment striking out the word "male" from the constitution was defeated by a majority of 3,285.

In Washington, a suffrage constitutional amendment was defeated by a majority of 9,882.

## IN 1899.

In Arizona, a bill granting full suffrage to women passed the lower branch of the Legislature, but was defeated in the upper.

In Arkansas, a school suffrage bill was defeated, 8 to 16.

In California, a bill granting school suffrage to women was killed by the pocket veto of the Governor.

In Connecticut, a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women was defeated in the House, 63 to 103. The bill was defeated in the Senate, 9 to 12.

In Illinois, bills allowing women to vote for town officers and allowing property-holding women to vote on questions regarding the expenditure of public funds were defeated in the Senate. Bills conferring presidential suffrage and license suffrage also failed.

In Iowa, a resolve for a constitutional amendment giving women full suffrage was defeated.

In Maine, petitioners for a bill to exempt women from taxation until they are allowed to vote, were given "leave to withdraw."

In Massachusetts, a proposed amendment to the constitution giving women full suffrage was rejected in the House, 31 to 82. A license suffrage bill was defeated 51 to 94, and a municipal suffrage bill was also defeated. The Senate concurred in this action.

In New Mexico, a school suffrage bill was defeated in the lower House.

In New York, a bill permitting women to vote on questions of municipal improvements, and a bill requiring that at least one third of the members of boards of education appointed by mayors shall be women, was defeated.

In Nevada, the Legislature rejected a resolution for a woman suffrage amendment.

In Oklahoma, the lower House passed, and the Senate rejected, a proposition to give women full suffrage.

In Missouri, a proposed constitutional amendment, striking out the word "male" as a qualification for voters, failed.

In Washington, a proposition to permit women to vote on the question, "Shall women be enfranchised?" was defeated in the committee of constitutional revision.

In West Virginia, a bill giving women full suffrage was defeated.